

Author: Derek Hilts at 1PO-SCES2  
Date: 5/22/97 7:14 AM  
Subject: CALFED Appx F - Existing Conditions Modeling, Documentation

Jean and Bob,

I don't know NEPA, therefore I don't know what purpose the Alternative 1 (Existing Conditions) case serves, but...

Assumptions are inconsistent -

Winter Run Biological Opinion: If upstream provisions are going to be represented, then the Delta provisions currently in effect, namely the closure of the cross channel gates Feb01-Apr30, should be represented as well.

CVPIA: If upstream provisions are going to be represented, they should be documented as highly preliminary, subject to change, rather than hard and fast guidance given in an official USBR letter. Secondly, if upstream AFRP proposed actions are going to be represented, then it seems logical that Delta AFRP proposed actions be represented. Thirdly, upstream AFRP proposed action on the Stanislaus is missing and should be added.

The Delta Smelt Biological Opinion provisions are missing altogether and should be added.

\*ATTENTION cc ed USBR folks\* Are you guys okay with these additional items - way the Stanislaus capacity is used and/or documented, 4600 cfs is assumed attainable at Tracy, no Cross Valley wheeling, Folsom flood control is using the variable diagram, CVP refuge demand representation. Please reply so we are on the same page. THANKS

OPTIONAL FORM 99 (7-90)

**FAX TRANSMITTAL**

# of pages ► 1

To <b>BOB PINJE</b>	From <b>JEAN EIDER</b>
Dept./Agency	Phone #
Fax # <b>653-5699</b>	Fax #

NSN 7540-01-317-7368

5099-101

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

H - 0 0 0 0 8 1

H-000081